



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,257	12/01/2000	Chad Schoettger	P5402	3873
32658	7590	07/29/2005	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500 1200 SEVENTEEN ST. DENVER, CO 80202			POLTORAK, PIOTR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/728,257

Applicant(s)

SCHOETTGER, CHAD

Examiner

Peter Poltorak

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/17/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13, 14, 16 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13, 14, 16 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-14, 16, 18-21 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-14, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 1, 10 and 16 recite: "modifying the response to remove all of the identification information". The limitation suggests removing all of the identification but then it suggests that not all has been removed (whereby access to the computer device to obtain the response is hidden from the external client). Also, it is not clear how the communication can be conducted between two entities after all of the identification information are removed from a response.
3. Claims 2-3, 6-9, 11, 13-14 and 18 are rejected by virtue of their dependence.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2134

4. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-14, 16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. As suggested above the limitations in claims 1, 10 and 16 are not understood.
For purposes of further examination the phrase "all of" is ignored.
6. In claim 19 "the received response" and "the modified response" lack antecedent basis.
7. Claims 2-3, 6-9, 11, 13-14 and 18 are rejected by virtue of their dependence.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. **Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-11, 13-14, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Birrell et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5805803).**
9. As per claims 10-11 and 14 *Birrell et al.* teach a tunnel mechanism (143) between a host (110) and a computer device (150), wherein the tunnel mechanism is in communication with the host and the computer device (*Fig. 1*).

10. The tunnel mechanism receives a token and an access request from the external client. After validating the token the tunnel mechanism behaves as a conventional proxy server (*col. 4 lines 47-54*).
11. This reads on receiving with a tunnel mechanism an access request from the external client device to the internal network device, the tunnel mechanism being communicatively linked to an interface of the internal device, and on verifying that the external device is currently authenticated as an authorized user.
12. *Birrell et al.* teach that the tunnel mechanism receives the URL of the requested resource and the redirected URL is chosen so that a "host name" is the host name of the tunnel mechanism. When the tunnel mechanism receives a request for such a URL it can recover the original URL and proxy the request to the resource inside the firewall associated with that URL (*col. 4 line 65- col. 5 line 12*).
13. This reads on modifying the access request to include an address of the interface of the internal device and on operating the tunnel mechanism to route the modified access request to the interface of the internal device and modifying the response with the tunnel mechanisms to remove the identification information prior to transmittal of the modified response to the external client device, wherein the identification information includes URL information for the internal device and response modifying includes replacing the internal device URL information with URL information for the tunnel mechanism, whereby the internal device is hidden from the external client device with the response appearing to originate from the tunnel mechanism.

Art Unit: 2134

14. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 16, 18 are substantially equivalent to claims 10-11 and 14; therefore claims 1-3, 5-6, 16, 18 are similarly rejected.
15. As per claim 13 *Birrell et al.* teach that the object 150 in Fig. 1 represents intranet, which comprises multiple web servers (*col. 3 lines 17-18*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 7, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Birrell et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5805803) in view of *Dennis et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5913922).
17. *Birrell et al.* teach a communication the response transmitted to the external device as discussed above.
- Birrell et al.* do not explicitly teach examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and including the error message in the response transmitted to the external client.
18. *Dennis et al.* teach examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and including the error message in the response (*Dennis et al.*, Fig. 4, *col. 4 lines 38-47*).

Art Unit: 2134

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and including the error message in the response transmitted to the external client as taught by Dennis et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to inform the user about the error (*Dennis et al. col. 4 line 45*).

Not including identification information for the interior device in the modified response would be implicit.

19. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Birrell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5805803)* in view of *Berstis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6092100)*.

Birrell et al. teach a communication the response transmitted to the external device as discussed above.

Birrell et al. do not explicitly teach examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and operating the tunnel mechanism to take corrective actions to remove the error message from the response from the computer device.

20. *Berstis et al.* teach examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and taking corrective actions to remove the error message from the response from the computer device (*Berstis et al. col. 2 lines 43-47*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and taking corrective actions to remove the error message from the

Art Unit: 2134

response from the computer device as taught by *Berstis et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to intelligently resolve an incorrect URL requests (*Berstis et al. col. 1 lines 64-66*).

21. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Birrell et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5805803) and in view of *Flyntz et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6351817).

22. *Birrell et al.* teach verifying authentication as discussed above.

Birrell et al. do not explicitly teach the verifying including determining a level of the authorized access and, the routing including limiting the access request to the computer device to the determined level of the authorized access.

23. *Flyntz et al.* teach verifying including determining a level of the authorized access (*Flyntz et al. col. 1 lines 31-36*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include determining a level of the authorized access when verifying as taught by *Flyntz et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to make it impossible for an authorized user at one security level to access data at a security level for which he is not authorized (*Flyntz et al. col. 1 lines 36-38*).

24. *Flyntz et al.* provides a clear suggestion that requests will be routed according to the level of requester's security, therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include in routing the limiting the access request to the computer device to the determined level of the authorized

Art Unit: 2134

access. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to enforce the verification.

25. Claims 1-3, 5, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bal et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6457061) and in further view of *Stein* (Lincoln D. Stein, "Web Security, "A step-by-step reference Guide, ISBN 0-201-63489-9, 1998) and in further view of *Flyntz et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6351817).

26. *Bal et al.* teach a tunnel mechanism (*network address translation*) that changes external addresses to internal addresses and internal to external addresses (*pg. 3 line 54-58 and col. 4 lines 25-50*). *Bal et al.* also teach a method for providing an external client (*Fig. 2, Internet 100 node*) with selective access to a computer device (*Fig. 2, LAN 140 node*) protected behind a host (*Fig. 2, object 230*). Tunnel mechanism is in communication with the host and the computer device. The tunnel mechanism receives an access request to the computer device from the external client as lines 9-13 col. 4 show that all the communication passes through the tunnel mechanism and as Fig. 2 shows the tunnel mechanism implemented on the host. Thus each request from an external client directed to a computer device is received by the tunnel mechanism before reaching the destination.

27. *Bal et al.* do not teach the tunnel mechanism being communicatively linked to the firewall (*pg. 387*).

Art Unit: 2134

Stein teaches firewalls. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement a firewall system into *Bal et al.*'s invention as taught by *Stein*, which would read on the tunnel mechanism being communicatively linked to the firewall. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to prevent network attacks (*Stein* pg. 387).

28. *Bal et al.* do not teach verifying whether the external client currently has authorized access to the host.
29. *Stein* teaches verifying whether an external client currently has authorized access to the host (*Stein, Access Control Based on User Name and Password*, pg. 255-261).
30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention include verification whether an external client currently has authorized access to the host as taught by *Stein* for motivation of benefit of increased security.
31. Claims 7, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bal et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6457061) in view of *Stein* (Lincoln D. Stein, "Web Security, "A step-by-step reference Guide, ISBN 0-201-63489-9, 1998) and *Flyntz et al.* and in further view of *Dennis et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5913922).
32. *Bal et al.* in view of *Stein* and in further view of *Flyntz et al.* teach a method as discussed above.

Bal et al. in view of *Stein* and in further view of *Flyntz et al.* do not explicitly teach examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and including the error message in the response transmitted to the external client.

33. *Dennis et al.* teach examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and including the error message in the response (*Dennis et al.*, Fig. 4, col. 4 lines 38-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and including the error message in the response transmitted to the external client as taught by *Dennis et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to inform the user about the error (*Dennis et al.* col. 4 line 45).

Not including identification information for the interior device in the modified response would be implicit.

34. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bal et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6457061) in view of *Stein* (Lincoln D. Stein, "Web Security, "A step-by-step reference Guide, ISBN 0-201-63489-9, 1998) and in further view of *Berstis et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6092100).

Bal et al. in view of *Stein* and in further view of *Flyntz et al.* teach a communication the response transmitted to the external device as discussed above.

Bal et al. in view of *Stein* and in further view of *Flyntz et al.* do not explicitly teach examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and operating the tunnel mechanism to take corrective actions to remove the error message from the response from the computer device.

Art Unit: 2134

35. *Berstis et al.* teach examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and taking corrective actions to remove the error message from the response from the computer device (*Berstis et al. col. 2 lines 43-47*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement examining the response for an error message, translating the error message, and taking corrective actions to remove the error message from the response from the computer device as taught by *Berstis et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to intelligently resolve an incorrect requests (*Berstis et al. col. 1 lines 64-66*).

36. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bal et al.*

(*U.S. Patent No. 6457061*) in view of *Stein* (*Lincoln D. Stein, "Web Security, "A step-by-step reference Guide, ISBN 0-201-63489-9, 1998*) and in further view of *Flyntz et al.* (*U.S. Patent No. 6351817*).

37. *Bal et al.* in view of *Stein* and in further view of *Flyntz et al.* teach verifying authentication as discussed above.

Bal et al. in view of *Stein* and in further view of *Flyntz et al.* do not explicitly teach the verifying including determining a level of the authorized access and, the routing including limiting the access request to the computer device to the determined level of the authorized access.

38. *Flyntz et al.* teach verifying including determining a level of the authorized access (*Flyntz et al. col. 1 lines 31-36*).

Art Unit: 2134

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include determining a level of the authorized access when verifying as taught by *Flyntz et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to make it impossible for an authorized user at one security level to access data at a security level for which he is not authorized (*Flyntz et al. col. 1 lines 36-38*).

39. *Flyntz et al.* provides a clear suggestion that requests will be routed according to the level of requester's security, therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include in routing the limiting the access request to the computer device to the determined level of the authorized access. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to enforce the verification.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Poltorak whose telephone number is (571) 272-3840. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Signature
7/22/05
Date

David Y. Jung
Primary Examiner

7/24/05
D. Y. Jung